

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 31 is amended. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nasri at the interview held January 26, 2006, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

I. Claim Amendments

Claim 31 is amended. Examiner Nasri asserted during the personal interview that claim 31 should be amended to clarify that the "entire optical waveguide member is provided solely on the convex member." Although Applicants do not believe such claim amendment is necessary, the claims are amended to expedite prosecution by making explicit what was already implicit in claim 31. Thus, claim 31 is not narrowed by the amendment.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. §102(b) Rejection of Claim 31

The Office Action rejects claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,534,101 to Keyworth et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, claim 31 is not anticipated by Keyworth. Keyworth does not disclose that the "entire optical waveguide member is provided solely on the convex member," as recited in claim 31.

As discussed during the personal interview, as shown in Figure 3 of Keyworth, the light guide is formed on the core 72 and the substrate 10. Thus, Keyworth does not disclose the optical waveguide recited in claim 31.

Therefore, claim 31 is patentable over Keyworth. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 16, 18-26 and 28-31

The Office Action also rejects claims 16, 18-26 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,065,881 to Okada. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, claims 16, 18-26 and 28-31 are not anticipated by Okada. Okada does not disclose "an optical waveguide member being provided solely on the convex member," as recited in independent claim 16, and similarly recited in independent claims 26 and 31.

As agreed during the personal interview, Figure 17A of Okada does not show an optical waveguide, but shows only an intermediate step of a process to form an optical transmission line. Further, Okada, as shown in Fig. 8, clearly discloses an optical transmission line 40 that is formed on the first optical transmission terminal 21 and the second optical transmission terminal 22. See, e.g., col. 16, lines 21-46, col. 17, lines 32-41, and Fig. 8 of Okada. Thus, Okada does not disclose an optical waveguide member being formed solely on the convex member.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 16, 26 and 31 are patentable over Okada. Further, claims 18-25 and 28-30, which variously depend from claims 16 and 26, are also patentable over Okada for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 16 and 26, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-15 and 27

The Office Action rejects claims 1-15 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Okada. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, claims 1-15 and 27 would not have been rendered obvious by Okada. Okada does not teach or suggest "the optical waveguide member

being formed solely along the convex member," as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 9.

As discussed during the personal interview, Fig. 17A of Okada does not disclose hardening the precursor to form an optical waveguide member, the optical waveguide member being formed solely along the convex member. As discussed above, Okada clearly teaches formation of the optical waveguide between the convex member and second terminal.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 9 are patentable over Okada. Further, claims 2-8, 10-15 and 27, which variously depend from claims 1, 9 and 26, are also patentable over Okada for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1, 9 and 26, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/jfb

Date: February 10, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461